DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 392 SO 034 433

AUTHOR	Stradling, Robert
TITLE	Conference on "The Initial and In-Service Training of History Teachers in South East Europe" (Athens, Greece, September 28-30, 2000).
INSTITUTION	Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France).
PUB DATE	2000-09-00
NOTE	61p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council of Europe, 67075 Strasbourg, Cedex, France. Tel: 33-3-88-41-20-00; Web site: http://www.coe.int.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	Civil Liberties; Democracy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; History; History Instruction; *Inservice Teacher Education; Peace; *Planning; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Europe (Southeast); European Union; *History Teachers

ABSTRACT

The Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe was adopted by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the European Union in Cologne (Germany). They were subsequently endorsed by 40 partner countries and international organizations which undertook to strengthen the countries of Southeastern Europe in their efforts to foster peace, democracy, respect for human rights and economic prosperity to achieve stability in the whole region. Three working tables were established: (1) "Democratization and Human Rights"; (2) "Economic Reconstruction"; and (3) "Security Issues." The conference, organized jointly by the Council of Europe and the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs in Greece, was the first of a planned series of activities and projects on the training of history teachers in the region. It was initiated under the framework for action of working table 1 of the Stability Pact. The conference report is divided into eight sections: (1) "Stability Pact"; (2) "History and History Teaching in South East Europe"; (3) "I. The Context"; (4) "II. Preamble"; (5) "III. Aims of the Conference"; (6) "IV. Taking Stock: The Current Situation for Initial and In-Service Training"; (7) "V. Planning the Initial and In-Service Training of History Teachers: Some Fundamental Issues and Concerns"; and (8) "VI. Conclusions and Recommendations." Reports from the workshops are appended, including questions on the use of maps for teaching history, a list of participants, and the conference program. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 470 392

Athens, Greece, 28-30 September 2000

Conference on "The initial and in-service training of history teachers in South East Europe"

Report by Dr. Robert STRADLING, Leirsinn Research Centre, University of the Highlands & Islands, Scotland

SO 034 433

Council of Europe
F67075 Strasbourg Cedex, France

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Borch-Jacobsen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu..ent do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

STABILITY PACT

HISTORY AND HISTORY TEACHING IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE

I. THE CONTEXT

II. PREAMBLE

III. AIMS OF THE CONFERENCE

IV. TAKING STOCK: THE CURRENT SITUATION FOR INITIAL AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

V. PLANNING THE INITIAL AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF HISTORY TEACHERS: SOME FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX II

APPENDIX III

APPENDIX IV

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

I. THE CONTEXT

In June 1999, the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe was adopted by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the European Union in Cologne and subsequently endorsed by 40 partner countries and international organisations which undertook to strengthen the countries of South Eastern Europe "in their efforts to foster peace, democracy, respect for human rights and economic prosperity in order to achieve stability in the whole region". Three Working Tables have been established:

Working Table I: Democratisation and Human Rights
Working Table II: Economic Reconstruction
Working Table III: Security Issues.

The idea for the Stability Pact had emerged in late 1998 as a means of building on earlier agreements and regional initiatives and co-ordinating various ongoing activities which were aimed at greater co-operation with and within the region of south eastern Europe. For example, in November 1998, Austria, while it held the Presidency of the European Union, organised in Graz an International Conference on Southeast Europe: European Educational Co-operation for Peace, Stability and Democracy". This Conference provided an opportunity for looking at ways of strengthening and broadening educational co-operation with and within the region. The main outcome was that an international Task Force was established, under the title of "The Graz Process" to facilitate the co-ordination of a programme of action for educational co-operation. The work of this Task Force has been incorporated into the activities of Working Table I of the Stability Pact.

It was recognised from the outset that potentially history education and history teaching had an important role to play in fostering mutual understanding and reconciliation in the region. Consequently, in October 1999, under the auspices of the Graz Process, a workshop on *'History and history teaching in South Eastern Europe'* was held in Graz. This was organised jointly by KulturKontakt, the Council of Europe and the Centre for the Study of Balkan Societies and Cultures (CSBSC) at the University of Graz. The main aim of the Graz Workshop was to identify, develop, and support the implementation of a flexible framework of action for the region which would begin the process of establishing a network of organisations and individuals across

the region able and willing to co-operate in developing and implementing a range of projects and regional initiatives in history teaching at all educational levels.

Subsequently, several Working Groups were set up to co-ordinate initiatives on different aspects of education and educational development, and the Council of Europe assumed responsibility for co-ordinating the Working Group concerned with developing and implementing a programme on history and history teaching in South East Europe. This Working Group recognised that one of the key elements in its Programme of Action would need to be the provision of support for the initial and in-service training of history teachers, with a particular emphasis on teaching regional history, teaching history from a comparative perspective, incorporating a multiplicity of historical perspectives on significant events and developments in the region into their teaching and using pedagogical approaches that would encourage active learning, the application of enquiry-based methods and the development of critical thinking and historical consciousness.

The Conference on "The initial and in-service training of history teachers in South East Europe" held in Athens on 28-30 September 2000, which was organised jointly by the Council of Europe and the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs in Greece, was the first of a planned series of activities and projects on the training of history teachers in the region to be initiated under the framework for action of Working Table I of the Stability Pact.

II. PREAMBLE

The Conference opened on the morning of the 28 September 2000 with expressions of sadness and condolences to our Greek hosts and to the relatives of those who had died when the ferry, *Express Samina*, sank in the Aegean off the island of Paros just 24 hours earlier.

Mr Christos Doukas, General Secretary in charge of Adult Education at the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs in Greece, opened the Conference by welcoming the new programme of activities on history and history teaching in South East Europe, an area in political transition. He particularly welcomed the Conference's focus on the initial and in-service

training of history teachers, stressing that teacher training has an important role to play not simply in the professional development of teachers but in the development and shaping of education systems.

Mr Klaus Schuman, Director General for Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, Environnement at the Council of Europe, explained the aims and objectives of the conference and expressed the hope that the three workshops running concurrently through the programme would generate a series of clear proposals for regional workshops for history teachers and those who train them. The participants had been invited because they were in a good position to indicate the training needs of history teachers in their countries, and because they had a potential role to play in the future as 'multipliers' who could contribute to the development and delivery of new training programmes. He stressed that the Conference in Athens presented an opportunity for a genuine mutual exchange of experience and expertise, and for discussing what represented good practice and innovation in history teaching.

III. AIMS OF THE CONFERENCE

There were three main objectives:

- To share information about the current provision of initial and in-service training for history teachers in the countries represented at the conference and to identify the similarities and differences, the problems and constraints on development, the gaps in provision, and the priorities for future development.

- To identify practical ways of helping history teachers to introduce a comparative, transnational perspective into their teaching, to handle sensitive and controversial topics and themes in appropriate ways, and to introduce some active learning and enquiry-based learning approaches into their teaching.

- To plan programmes of action for the next three years that would include a series of bilateral and multilateral workshops and seminars on initial training, in-service training and the development of additional teaching resources. These activities would be targeted on:

- Those who are training the next generation of history teachers;
- Those who provide in-service training for teachers;
- Those who can act as change agents for history teaching at official levels, through the work of non-governmental organisations and history teachers' associations, in the universities, and in schools.

To establish a stocktaking baseline, all participants were sent a questionnaire two months before the Conference requesting information about the content and structure of history curricula, any content areas which were perceived to be problematic for teachers, the structures for initial and in-service training and the priorities for development, and the main training needs of history teachers. The delegates from the education ministries in the countries represented at the conference were also asked to produce national reports on history education and the training of history teachers.

Although there were several plenary sessions with keynote presentations, the key task of developing programmes of action was facilitated primarily through three workshops, each of which was directed by an animator, which met four times over the course of the Conference.

Workshop A was animated by Dr Alois ECKER. The main focus here was on the initial training of history teachers:

- the key issues and concerns;
- qualifications and standards;
- structures;
- history didactics;
- teaching practice;
- training the trainers;
- the scope for greater co-operation on initial training.

A major dimensions of this Group's work centred on the planning of a cross-national investigation of initial training for history teachers which would provide an empirical baseline for identifying priorities for future development.

Workshop B was animated by Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD. This Group began by looking at what makes good in-service training for history teachers, went on to identify priorities for future

development, and finally developed some models for regional in-service training seminars.

Workshop C was animated by Dr Ioanna LALIOTOU. The main focus here was on the scope for introducing transnational history into national history curricula. This included exploring the pedagogical issues associated with teaching the history of one's neighbours and the question of taking into account how one's own history is perceived by people in other countries. This involved looking at possible strategies and methods for teaching controversial and sensitive issues and themes including national disasters, civil wars and cross-border conflicts. The workshop also looked at approaches to transnational history which took into account the social and cultural dimensions and not just political history.

IV. TAKING STOCK: THE CURRENT SITUATION FOR INITIAL AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING

The majority of the participants completed the pre-conference questionnaire or produced national reports on history education. All of the countries had initiated or were planning major reforms in history curricula, textbooks and teacher training for history teachers. In some countries, change was more advanced than elsewhere but some common patterns and concerns emerged in participants' responses and these are briefly summarised below because they set the agenda for the subsequent discussions and developments during the workshops.

In all of the responding countries, history was a compulsory element of the school curriculum for at least some part of secondary education and on average students received around two hours of history teaching per week. Recent and ongoing curriculum reforms focused on the content of history courses, including the balance between political, social, cultural and economic history and the balance between national, regional, European and global history (although in most cases reforms had begun with the teaching of national history), and changes in pedagogic approaches to facilitate the development of active and enquiry-based learning, the use of primary and secondary sources and the development of historical consciousness. In most of the participating countries, changes in textbooks had been implemented following curriculum reforms although some

countries reported that developments were severely constrained by lack of adequate resources for textbook publishing.

Patterns of development in in-service training for teachers appeared to be variable across the region. In some of the countries, in-service training is compulsory and directly related to career promotion and salary levels. This takes various forms. In some cases, the graduate seeking employment as a teacher is required to undertake post-university training, which is partly on-the-job training and partly through attending courses run by specialist institutes or local education departments before they can work as a qualified history teacher. In some countries, participation in in-service training is either compulsory or directly linked to promotion and salary scales. In others, it is voluntary but provision is made for teachers who have the right to be released from teaching to attend in-service courses and seminars a certain number of working days per year (usually ranging between 5 and 10 days). The emerging pattern indicates that in-service training is being provided by a number of agencies, including national and local education departments, universities and pedagogic institutes, history teachers' associations and non-governmental organisations. There was also some evidence of grassroots developments including Teachers' Circles (Slovenia), and school-based INSET.

With a few exceptions, it would appear that developments in initial teacher training are lagging behind developments in curricula, textbooks and in-service training. One participant suggested that this may be because the universities and institutes responsible for this training have tended to be more resistant to change than other institutions involved in history education. The issue of *'Who trains the trainers*?' emerged on several occasions during our discussions. In virtually every participating country, the initial training of secondary-level history teachers took place in universities and lasted four years. As noted in Alois Ecker's report, which is appended to this report, two main structures of initial training predominate. The first is a "consecutive model, where general historical studies are followed by a period of professional and practical training (either in the final one or two semesters of University studies or through postgraduate on-the-job training. The second is a "concurrent model" where general, professional and practical courses take place in parallel. In some cases, students studied history, in other instances history was studied in combination with another

discipline, such as geography. There were some exceptions. Currently, students wishing to train to be history teachers have to go to Belgrade University and, in Greece, there is, as yet, no initial teacher training specifically for history teachers (and history teaching tends to be done by graduates from the Universities' Schools of Philosophy).

It was clear that, in some countries, the main impetus for change in initial training was the perceived need to bring teaching qualifications into line with European-wide standards and practices.

In the pre-conference questionnaire, the participants were asked to identify the main priorities for initial and in-service training of history teachers in their countries. The main priorities for initial training identified by them were as follows:

- more provision for student teachers to do some extended teaching practice in schools;

- more emphasis on history didactics and pedagogy;

- more training in the use of active learning methods;

- more training on differentiated teaching, i.e. working with different ability levels;

- greater congruence between initial training courses and the history taught in schools;

- more done by governments to raise the status of history teaching and thereby enhance its profile as a desirable career for graduates.

The main priorities for in-service training of history teachers were identified as:

- more emphasis on providing practical workshops for teachers;

- compulsory provision of INSET;

- better resourcing of INSET courses, seminars and workshops;

- the development of INSET through distance learning for teachers working -in more remote rural areas;

- the development of appropriate training materials;

- the need to establish national and regional in-service training networks;

- the need for greater co-ordination between initial and in-service teacher training.

The pre-conference questionnaire was also designed to elicit the participants' views about the kinds of topics and themes on which history teachers needed further training. A number of topics, periods and themes were identified as being particularly difficult to teach. The periods most commonly raised were:

- the early origins of the peoples of the region;
- the early Middle Ages;
- Ottoman period;
- the 20th Century;
- the communist era.

The topics and themes which were thought to present teachers with most difficulties were:

- the Balkan Wars;
- Civil Wars;
- World War II;
- Cold War;
- ideological movements in the 20th Century;
- 20th Century dictatorships;
- the recent conflicts in the region;
- the period of democratic transition since 1989.

It is interesting to note here that all of these topics could be said to relate to modern political history. However, some respondents also mentioned that teachers often find it very difficult to teach some aspects of social history, particularly the history of everyday life.

We asked respondents why they thought these periods, themes and topics were proving difficult for teachers. Their responses are summarised below:

- teachers have to be confident (and need training) in using multiple interpretations;

- some of these topics, themes and eras are nationally or regionally sensitive;
teachers do not always have a regional overview;

- there is a lack of good resources on some periods and the resources available are not sufficiently challenging or multiperspectival;

- there is a lack of available primary source material on some periods;
the textbook coverage of some of these topics and themes has been written by academic historians in a style of writing and at a level of abstraction which the students find too difficult;

- the students are not interested in some of these topics and themes.

The problems associated with teaching the history of everyday life were mainly attributed to the dearth of good resources on social and cultural history. Some respondents also observed that where teachers were being given some degree of choice in either the selection of curriculum topics or the ways in which they are approached, then they were finding it very difficult to decide what to include and what to omit.

Finally, respondents were also asked to specify what they were hoping to get from this Conference in Athens and any workshops which emerged as a result of the planning process within the three workshops. The following were all identified as priorities but respondents were also asked to rank order them so they have been presented according to whether they were assigned a high, medium or low priority.

HIGH PRIORITY
Using active learning methods
Working with primary sources and evidence-based learning
Teaching sensitive and controversial topics and themes
Organising small group work with students
Teaching 20th Century history

MEDIUM PRIORITY
Using new technologies in the history classroom
Making effective use of museums and other out-of-school learning opportunities
Enquiry-based learning
Using a variety of source materials including photographs, audio-visual material, oral history, etc
Assessing what students are learning
Developing teaching materials to supplement the textbook

LOW PRIORITY
Organising project work with students
Teaching history to all ability levels including slow learners and students with learning difficulties
Teaching history to different age groups

The conference organisers attempted to take these responses into account and it was apparent from observing each session and getting feedback from participants that both the organisers and the workshop animators had made great efforts, and proved very successful, in responding to these perceived needs and priorities.

V. PLANNING THE INITIAL AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF HISTORY TEACHERS: SOME FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES AND CONCERNS

In the course of the plenary and workshop sessions, a number of significant issues emerged and this section of the report is an attempt to reflect on these issues and explore possible ways forward.

The first issue relates to the nature of history. In the first keynote lecture, Professor KREMIDAS asserted that it is the job of the historian to find out what really happened. Most people working in the discipline would probably agree with that statement up to a point. They might also want to add that it is also part of the historian's job to find out why things happened as well. Professor KREMIDAS then went on to imply that it was, therefore, the job of the history teacher to tell his or her students what happened (and why). He stressed the importance

of the pursuit of historical truth and of history teachers telling the truth (the scientific truth) to their pupils.

I would support wholeheartedly his defence of history and history education from those who wish to use it to promote particular ideological positions. I would also wish to support his defence of history and history education against those who adopt a wholly relativist position - who believe that any interpretation of events is as acceptable as any other, those who, in his graphic phrase, go to the vineyard of history and pick what they want from it. However, those who talk about the importance of multiperspectivity and introducing students to different interpretations and explanations of particular historical events and developments are not supporting a relativist position. They assume that, for the most part, historians deal with historical evidence not historical truth. More often than not that evidence is incomplete and provisional and therefore:

- there may not be one correct version of events;

- it may be that the same piece of evidence can be interpreted differently by different historians depending on their perspective, the time when they were writing and the connections which they seek to make between that piece of evidence and other evidence;

- it is certainly the case that many sources of historical evidence (official documents, statistics, archives, eye witness accounts) are far from objective and impartial;

- and, above all, it is obvious that the same apparently clear and unambiguous statement can still have very different meanings for people depending on their particular situation.

I am not raising this point simply in order to engage in an academic debate with another historian. This really is a fundamental issue for history education which has implications for what is taught, why it is taught and how it is taught. As Dr. LALIOTOU observed when summarising discussions in Workshop C, similar debates are currently taking place on these questions in academic history, in the training of history teachers and history teaching at secondary school level.

The second general issue centres on the question: How can we introduce a more regional, transnational perspective into our history teaching? I would suggest that whether or not there is scope within the history curriculum in a particular country to introduce whole units on Balkan history or simply to introduce a regional dimension into the coverage of one or two topics or themes it is still possible to try to establish a balance between what could be called the vertical and the horizontal historical perspectives.

The vertical perspective relates to the study of change and continuity over time. In the context of regional history, it involves the student in:

- Developing some understanding of the forces shaping events and the key turning points;

- Understanding some key lines of development over an extended period of time;

- Being able to trace back the development of a major regional issue or problem to its roots;

- Being able to identify the consequences and significance to the region of particular important historical events and developments.

The horizontal perspective relates to setting specific national or local events, developments and trends into their wider regional context rather than reducing them to a single linear narrative. We had an excellent example of this from Professor KREMIDAS when he described the peoples of the Ottoman Empire looking to the west just at that point when the imperial power was becoming weaker and new ideas in the west concerning nationalism and self-determination were emerging. Looking at the horizontal perspective involves the student in:

- Comparing and contrasting some event or development in their own country with the equivalent in neighbouring countries;

- Comparing and contrasting ways of life in different parts of the region;

- Looking at how events and developments in their own country have influenced or been influenced by what has happened elsewhere in the region and outside the region;

- Demonstrating how neighbouring cultures have influenced each other;

- Exploring how long-term rivalries and divisions have affected recent history.

It should be stressed here again that this is not offered as a kind of blueprint for changing a national history curriculum into a regional history curriculum. It could just as easily apply to teaching one or two topics or themes.

A third issue was raised by Professor LIVIERATOS in his fascinating presentation on the use of maps in history education. He raised a lot of questions for us to consider and these have been appended to this report because they present a framework both for thinking about the use of maps in history teaching and also for evaluating the maps which appear in textbooks and other teaching resources. But, at this point, I want to refer to the distinction he made in history teaching between the development of knowledge and the acquisition of information. As you may recall he described knowledge as 'familiarity with a theme gained through study and experience', whereas information related to 'growing awareness about a theme through acquiring sets of data'.

He went on to say that the acquisition of information does not lead to deep understanding and further suggested that students only start to acquire knowledge at the postgraduate level. Now, of course, the notion of deep understanding is relative and clearly postgraduate students have a much deeper understanding of what they are studying than school students of 16 to 18 years of age. But I would suggest that history educators at the secondary level are not just concerned - and should not just be concerned - with imparting information to their students. We also want them to understand something about the nature of that information to critically analyse it and not just take it as a given, we want them to examine it for bias, stereotypes and prejudice, and to relate it to, and make connections with, other information or evidence that they have acquired, and so on. In other words, the development of

students' historical knowledge and historical understanding is a major function of school history as well as academic history. What distinguishes the two is the depth of that understanding.

The next issue relates to textbooks and curricula which present the student with a kind of linear, mainly chronological narrative of events. In at least two of the workshops, there has been some discussion about existing textbooks and curricula and possibilities for new developments. But one potential problem I would like to raise with you is how can we counter the tendency in our students, often reinforced by textbooks and other educational and broadcasting media, to assume that what actually happened was inevitable. How can we, instead, help them to get a better understanding of the dynamics of history: how can we help them to better understand people's actions, and the meaning they had for them at the time, when the students already know the outcome. When we know what actually happened, it becomes much harder to step into the minds and motives of the people involved at the time and to recognise that the issues facing them were not straightforward, and they were not necessarily clear about the best course of action to take. This highlights the need for teachers to help students to develop the skill of empathy through role play and using letters and diary extracts, but it also involves attempting to create learning situations in which the student is placed in the role of historical detective:

- Looking for clues to the motives of the people involved;

- Looking at attitudes and mindsets at the time;

- Looking for corroborative evidence from different sources;

- Assessing whether these clues were consistent with all of the other information available to them;

- Looking for the decisive moments, actions and events which triggered off subsequent events.

In this way, they can start to examine what might be called some of the historical puzzles. For example:

- Why did a local conflict between Austria and Serbia in 1914 escalate so quickly into a war involving much of Europe, Turkey,

the Middle East, parts of Africa and eventually the United States and Japan?

- Why did the Soviet Union enter into a non-aggression pact with Germany in August 1939 when Hitler's intentions towards the Soviet Union were well known to them?

- Why did so many communist governments collapse so quickly from 1989 onwards?
and so on.

The next issue was fundamental to our discussions throughout the Conference in Athens. We talked about curriculum change, the need for a new generation of textbooks, the need to bring about fundamental changes in the initial and in-service training of history teachers. There was a good deal of agreement about the nature and direction of the changes that were necessary. Firstly, a greater emphasis on practical training and secondly, an emphasis within that training and in classroom teaching on:

- Active learning;
- Multiperspectivity;
- Developing the students' analytical and interpretative skills;
- Handling controversial and sensitive topics.

The critical question which workshops began to address and which will need to be returned to again and again in subsequent workshops and seminars is this: *How do we translate the rhetoric of this into classroom reality?* What do concepts like multiperspectivity or active learning or analytical and interpretative skills actually mean? How would we recognise teaching that was designed to develop them?

What follows is a brief attempt to start that process of reflection on how to put rhetoric into practice.

Let us start with multiperspectivity. This is a way of thinking, a way of selecting, examining and using evidence from different sources in order to unravel the complexities of a particular historical situation in order to try and work out what happened and why. Just having access to different perspectives on the same historical phenomenon does not, in itself, guarantee that the approach will be multiperspectival, although it does ensure that we have a broader evidential base from which to launch an

historical enquiry. Multiperspectivity depends on our being able to relate the different perspectives to each other. So at the heart of this approach are a number of assumptions:

- In circumstances where different accounts of the same event reflect different perspectives then it is not necessarily the case that one of these versions must be the correct one. Some, if not all of them, may be equally valid, reflecting different experiences, contexts and objectives;

- In some situations, we would get a more accurate and comprehensive account of what happened if we perceived the different perspectives as tiles which make up a mosaic;

- Very few groups, cultures or nations could be said to be wholly autonomous. Their scope for action has been shaped and constrained by other groups, cultures and nations and they too influence or constrain the actions of others;

- In this respect, perception of `the other' and the relationship between `the other' and `the self' (or one's own group or nation) is at the heart of multiperspectivity;

- Finally, to understand each perspective, it is necessary to contextualise it. In other words, to establish where the holders of a particular viewpoint are coming from, their social, political or economic situation, their priorities and aims, their various obligations, their power and influence, the support they can count on from others.

As such multiperspectivity in history, I would suggest, aims to achieve three things:

- To gain a more comprehensive and broader understanding of historical events and developments;

- To gain a deeper understanding of the historical relationships between nations or cross-border neighbours or majorities and minorities within national borders;

- To gain a clearer understanding of the dynamics of what happened through examining the interactions between the people and groups involved and their interdependence.

Even with very limited sources and resources, it is still possible to get students to evaluate their own textbooks to see if they only look at events from one perspective and to identify those relevant perspectives which are missing. Similarly, it is also possible in one's teaching to start a new topic by specifically looking at it from the perspective of `the others', for example to start a unit on the Crusades from the point of view of the Arab chroniclers[1].

As noted earlier in this report, the need for training in the use of active learning was given a very high priority by most participants at the Conference. Undoubtedly, for many teachers, the introduction of active learning into their classroom practice would entail a significant shift away from a heavy reliance on instruction and exposition supported by the textbook account. It implies a greater flexibility in teaching; not just teaching the class as a whole, but also introducing activities that will facilitate independent learning and small group work. However, we should not necessarily assume that students are not actively learning when they are listening to a teacher, reading a textbook or watching a documentary video. Some history teachers have a gift for narrative that sustains the interest of their students and motivates them to think critically and question the evidence and its interpretation. Some teachers have refined their question-and-answer techniques and their student assignments and worksheets to such a degree that their essentially teacher-centred approach still ensures that the students do not adopt a passive approach to their learning. Similarly, some teachers can embrace every pedagogical innovation without stimulating their students to become active, critical and enquiring learners.

Of course, all teaching methods and strategies have their limitations and a reflective self-evaluative approach is an important element of all good practice. The impact of all approaches (whole-class teaching and independent work, active learning including active listening, enquiry-based approaches, critical reading, analysing and interpreting a range of primary and secondary sources, multiperspectivity, and so forth) need to be monitored by the teacher. Their value lies in whether or not they achieve their purpose.

Clearly, independent, active, enquiry-based learning needs to be resourced. The students need to be able to access extracts from primary and secondary sources and these extracts need to be

evaluated for suitability to the task in hand and to the age and ability levels of the students. This may have implications for the layout or design of the classroom; it will certainly require access to photocopying facilities and perhaps to other specialist equipment such as a computer with Internet access. Effective active learning also necessitates that the teacher has specified a clear set of learning objectives or outcomes for the students and has consciously related these objectives or outcomes to the content to be taught and the teaching and learning methods to be employed.

However, facilitating active learning also requires confidence on the part of teachers and it is difficult to see how they will achieve this if their own history education and training has not provided them with opportunities to also experience active, independent, enquiry-based learning.

This brings me to the question of how to help students to apply analytical and interpretative skills to different kinds of source of evidence. Professor LIVIERATOS gave us an excellent example of how students and teachers could apply these skills to historical maps. So often, a map is included in a textbook for little more than illustrative purposes. Sometimes thematic maps are included and these are discussed in the text. Sometimes the textbook includes a propaganda map which provides opportunities for discussing how maps can be used for the purposes of falsification or deliberate deformation of borders or international relations. However, it would be very unusual for a textbook (or a history teacher) to discuss with students the map as a form of symbolic representation. To discuss, for example, why the cartographer has chosen this particular scale or used these particular colours or symbols and the implications of doing so. But this would involve the students in the process of historical analysis and interpretation of visual sources.

Similarly, when students are looking at historical photographs, they need to understand that:

- Photographic sources are easily edited and manipulated;

- Photographs which are preserved for the historical record have been subjected to an intensive process of selection at several levels - decisions by the photographer, the news editor, the archivist;

- Photographs always reflect the conventions and expectations of the period when they were taken, and so on.

Dr BILALIS' presentation on using new information technologies in history teaching sparked off discussion about the need for students to apply the same analytical and interpretative skills to material which they find on the Internet as they would to an extract from a written source in their textbook or workbook.

But what does it mean when we say that students need to know how to analyse and interpret, for example, documentary source material - even if it is only a fairly short extract from a longer historical document? I would suggest that this involves encouraging students to ask a series of questions which could be grouped into five broad analytical process:

- Description:
- Who wrote this?
- When was it written?
- Who was it written for?
- What sort of document is it? (official report, diary, etc)
- What are the main points?

- Interpretation:
- Is this a primary or secondary source?
- Are there any clues to show if it is based on the writer's direct experience?
- Was the writer an eye witness?
- Was the writer in a good position to know what happened?
- Are there any clues as to how the writer got the information?
- Does this seem to be a reliable account? How do you know?
- Why was it written?
- What does it tell you about the writer's own point of view?
- Is it biased?

- Links to prior knowledge

- Are the facts in this source supported by facts you already know?
- Does it confirm or contradict those other sources?

- Identification of gaps in the evidence

- Any missing names, dates or other facts which would help you to answer the above questions?

- Identification of sources of further information

- Where could you go to check the information in this source or the writer's interpretation?

The terms controversial and sensitive issues are often used interchangeably. However, it is useful to distinguish between them. Elsewhere, I have suggested that, in an obvious sense, much of what is taught in history is controversial; there are disagreements about what happened, why it happened, and its significance. Sometimes these are purely academic controversies: two historians or two schools of thought interpreting the same evidence in different ways. Sometimes, these issues divide groups or whole societies or neighbouring countries. Such disputes may be about what happened, why it happened, who started it, who was right, who has been most selective with the evidence, and so on. Controversial issues which are socially divisive or divide nations are usually also sensitive; that is, they upset or disturb people's sensitivities, they call on people's loyalties, they arouse prejudices. In such circumstances, they can become sensitive for the teacher also, since some parents, their children, politicians or pressure groups may begin to question whether the issue should be taught or even whether a particular teacher should be allowed to continue teaching it. On the other hand, not all sensitive issues reflect contemporary social and political divisions in society or between nations. They may be sensitive because they relate to particularly painful, tragic, humiliating or divisive times in a country's past, and there is an understandable fear or concern that reference to them in history lessons might renew old wounds and divisions and bring back too many painful memories [2].

It is possible to teach students certain process skills and ways of looking at historical controversy which they can transfer from one issue or topic to another. Essentially this consists of:

Critically analysing the evidence and how it has been interpreted - not reducing the issue to simple dichotomies, sorting out the arguments of the various groups involved, sifting the relevant from the irrelevant information, recognising the limitations of

each piece of information, evaluating the likely biases of different sources, handling conflicting evidence or accounts of what happened, and so on. In this sense, adopting an approach very similar to the one outlined above.

Asking analytical questions about the public statements of those at the centre of the controversy: about their motives, the causes they attribute to the dispute, the information they omit from their version of what happened, the differences in their points of emphasis, the assumptions they have made and the evidence base for those assumptions.

Analysing the language that is used by people when they refer to the controversial issue or dispute: the use of false analogies, stereotypical thinking, appeals to the "lessons of history", use of emotive language and appeals to the prejudice of the reader, listener or viewer.

This suggests an emphasis on an enquiry-based active learning approach where students have access to a variety of source material, including documents, newspaper articles, media coverage, photographs, oral history, memorials and commemorations. The enquiry-based approach can also be appropriate for teaching about sensitive issues, but there is also the need to recognise that such issues and topics may disturb the students, their parents and the community at large and additional strategies may therefore be necessary. These could include, for example:

- Examining analogies and parallels to avoid arousing prejudices and loyalties or pushing students into "taking sides" ;

- Getting students to role play, using role reversals, playing "devil's advocate" or demythologising popularly-held beliefs by testing public statements against the available evidence;

- Using people's diaries and memoirs and doing some local oral history to explore how people have perceived events and how their perceptions might have been influenced or might have changed over time;

- Examining the dilemmas people may have faced when living through the disputes or events which are sensitive.

All of these approaches, whether for developing multiperspectivity, promoting active learning, developing students' analytical and interpretative skills, or handling controversial and sensitive issues, clearly have implications for curriculum planning and in-service training. Teachers trained in a more traditional, teacher-centred pedagogy will need a period of adjustment. They need time and a structured training process through which they can develop the skills for facilitating active, analytical and enquiry-based approaches to learning.

The same point applies to their students as well. Teachers may need to "model" certain analytical and interpretative skills several times before students start being able to do it themselves. For example, showing students how to critically analyse a map or a historic photograph or how to interpret oral testimony from an eye witness.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations of the three workshops are appended to this report and I think it is clear from those reports that a viable and practical programme of activities for supporting initial and in-service training of history teachers in the region has emerged as a result of the hard work of the animators and participants who co-operated in the workshops. I hope that these ideas and proposals can now be turned into realities by the project teams which have already received funding for developing the training of history teachers in the region and that the Working Group and the Graz Process Task Force will be able to obtain the necessary funding to implement some of the other ideas for projects which emerged during the Conference. Our Greek hosts have suggested organising a stocktaking conference some time in 2001-2 to evaluate progress. This will provide a very useful opportunity for a further exchange of information, experience and expertise as well as a chance to update ourselves on how the various seminar programmes, workshops and projects are faring.

Rather than duplicate the conclusions and recommendations of the three workshop animators, Alois ECKER, Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD and Ioanna LALIOTOU, I would like to draw some more general conclusions and recommendations about the

programme of activities which is now likely to be implemented over the next three years.

Firstly, a programme of activities to support initial teacher training. Workshop A exchanged information about the training systems in their respective countries and then looked in some detail at how to systematically collect information about the provision of initial training of history teachers across the region. This is not simply an academic exercise. It is critically important that good, comparative baseline data is available to assist the planning process at a national and local level but also to assist the process of designing appropriate regional seminars and workshops in the future to help train the trainers. It is clear that, while there are many shared issues and concerns, initial training of history teachers in different countries within the region is at different stages of development, and they have different priorities. This diversity will need to be taken into account in the planning of multilateral initiatives and activities.

The other two Workshops (B and C) focused more on in-service training and related issues of curriculum planning and resource development. I think there is a strong case for identifying the common ground between the recommendations of these two groups and exploring the possibility for their joining forces in the future. An approach which combines in-service training with the production of pilot resources and learning activities could be a highly fruitful development strategy. I would like to highlight three general points here.

It is critically important in planning any in-service training initiatives that some thought is given to the problem of how best to help teachers trained in one pedagogic tradition to effectively adopt the approaches and develop the skills which are central to a very different pedagogic tradition. The easy part is thinking of the topics and themes to be covered in such workshops. The difficult part is developing an appropriate training process. I would suggest here that teachers are most likely to adopt the methodologies associated with active learning, enquiry-based and evidence-based learning, handling controversial and sensitive topics and themes in a practical, hands-on way. Learning by doing. One possible strategy here would be for workshop participants to engage in the process of developing learning materials and learning activities structured around one or two topics related to the region or cross-border relations

which they can then try out in their classrooms or with other groups of teachers and evaluate the results.

I also want to reiterate the point raised in Workshop B where they felt that the proposed programme of regional in-service training workshops should be targeted on the multipliers, those who can go on and disseminate the thinking and the approaches to others. Group B opted for those who train the trainers. Group C also thought it was important to target the multipliers but included in this category not just the trainers but also curriculum officers, textbook authors, decision makers and a vanguard of history teachers. I think we can discuss who are the multipliers and it may well be that they differ in different countries but the fundamental strategy of targeting multipliers seems a very sensible and sound one, whoever they are in a particular country.

Finally, developments of the kind proposed here, particularly when their overall aim is to fundamentally change the ways teachers teach and the ways in which teachers are trained, require the support of decision makers and policy makers. They need to be won over, particularly if they have only recently instigated a series of changes in the content of the curriculum or in the provision of initial or in-service training. It is important, therefore, that any initiatives produce concrete changes that can be demonstrated to work, Only then are those who are responsible for curricula and training likely to be prepared to countenance further changes and reforms.

This brings me to a more general point by way of conclusion. Educational change takes time. Changes in curriculum content take time but generally they can be implemented more quickly than structural changes. Changes in pedagogy, characteristically take even longer. Typically, new ideas about pedagogy are taken up by a relatively small vanguard of teachers but then there is a long delay before the majority of teachers change their practice. We are talking 15 to 20 years here, at the least. This can lead to a certain amount of frustration and pessimism regarding the rate of change and the extent to which it seems to be constrained by limited financial and human resources. This is a fairly normal state of affairs. Most of the education systems in Western Europe introduced major curriculum reforms in the 1980s but they were still introducing significant revisions to their curricula and to the training of teachers in the 1990s.

It is important to adopt a realistic timescale for change, but it is equally important to identify appropriate targets within that timescale that represent real achievements which will sustain the commitment of those involved, motivate others to join in and mobilise educational administrations to incorporate these ideas and projects into their planning.

APPENDIX I . REPORTS FROM THE WORKSHOPS

Report of Workshop Group A: The Initial Training of History Teachers
Group Animator: Dr Alois Ecker, University of Vienna

Introduction

Participants in our group came from Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Greece, Romania, Slovenia, "the former Republic of Macedonia", Turkey and Montenegro.

The atmosphere of our work was friendly and open, we worked systematically but this did not mean without emotions. On the contrary, the touching experiences of teaching history during wartime - this was the case when members from Montenegro and Bosnia-Herzegovina talked of their experiences - but we were still able to analyse the complex structures underpinning their experiences by focusing on the key questions under discussion. We learned in practice what it could mean to work with sensitive issues: group members contributed very willingly to the interests of others here. The discussions were constructive and open but critical as well.

Procedures of the workshop

We started our group work by introducing ourselves, saying who we were and what motivated us to participate in a workshop on initial training. The group members had a variety of interests and concerns: some wanted to get more information about the structures operating in neighbouring countries, others wanted to exchange information and to share common experiences. A common interest was to look more deeply at the actual problems of initial teacher training (ITT) as most of the countries represented were experiencing reforms in this area. The second common interest was to discuss needs for future initial training and to develop recommendations.

We then started to exchange more information about the training systems in the countries represented within the group. It turned out that almost everywhere initial training for secondary school teachers of history takes place at universities

and that it normally lasts four years. Differences were apparent concerning the organisation of ITT. Although we recognised that because universities are generally autonomous in the development of their curricula, the structures will differ substantially in the details, we identified two main structural patterns. For instance, in Slovenia and Turkey, we heard about a dominant consecutive model, which means that the general courses during studies are followed by a longer period of practical and professional training; the latter either at the end of university studies (8th semester in Turkey) or as a one-year postgraduate training on-the-job (Slovenia). In Albania and Romania (especially in the second half of the studies), the concurrent model prevails. In this model, general, professional and practical courses take place during the same period of studies. Both the concurrent and the consecutive models are to some extent ideal types. For example, it would seem that a small amount of professional education and practical training can also be offered during the period of general courses at universities.

We also learned that there are different combinations of studies. History teaching may be studied as a single subject or as a major double subject (Slovenia). If this is the case, it takes place either in a fixed combination: with geography (Albania) or with literature (Bulgaria). We also learned that there is no special initial teacher training for history teachers in Greece. Students who attain a university degree in history are allowed to teach history at school level. In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the educational authorities are just planning to re-establish a unified system of ITT, while students in Montenegro currently have to go to Belgrade University to train as history teachers - which is often experienced as a kind of repression of freedom, especially when they feel that they are being trained to teach an ideologically-biased form of history. Attention was also given to questions of practical training, the role of advisory teachers, the possibility of institutional links between universities and schools, entry requirements, final examinations and the professional profile of teachers.

We then had a very lively discussion on the more qualitative aspects of ITT. Our colleague from Turkey reflected on multiperspectival approaches in history teaching by describing how, in some Turkish textbooks, the events in 1452 are described as "the conquest of Constantinople" while, in Greek

textbooks, these events are more likely to be referred to as "the fall of Istanbul (or Constantinople)". Our colleague from Bosnia-Herzegovina reported a similar issue regarding Gavrilo Princip, the man who shot Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo. In textbooks in the former Yugoslavia, Princip was regarded as a "hero", while nowadays, he is more likely to be called a "terrorist".

In the second session of the workshop, participants learned more about the planned comparative study of ITT which will be organised as a joint project of the Council of Europe and the Institute of Social and Economic History at the University of Vienna. Prior to the next session, they were asked to have a look at the categories and questions in the draft questionnaire which had been prepared for this project and to help to revise it in the light of their knowledge of ITT in their own countries. We then spent the next session of the workshop discussing the questionnaire and adding some questions which would elicit more information about the practice of ITT across the region. We also developed questions concerning the representation of minorities in history curricula and asked whether special support would be given to the topic in teacher training. This session finished with a discussion of the representation of "the Other" in history teaching and what could be useful attainment targets in this respect for history curricula and for curricula in ITT for history teachers.

During this discussion, we identified a series of crucial priorities which should be tackled in a concrete way within ITT during the next few years:

1. Priorities for the content of school curricula:

consideration needs to be given to the representation of ethnic and national minorities and to the history of their existence and their ties with mother countries; the perception of "the Other" in history, dealing with sensitive issues, learning how to analyse sources, the development of critical thinking and multiperspectivity.

Priorities for the content of history curricula in ITT:

developing learning structures and the skills of the history teacher for a multiperspectival approach, developing students'

critical thinking, dealing with minority issues and other sensitive issues in the classroom. Another priority is to develop the future teacher's skills in using and interpreting history sources in the classroom.

Priorities at the institutional level:

- The aims for ITT have to be declared clearly at the beginning of training and made transparent for the students (for example, by identifying a professional profile of the history teacher);

- Curricula should encourage the development of skills such as critical thinking, multiperspectival views of the past;

- The training of methodological and practical skills should be improved in both the quantity of courses and hours devoted to this task and in terms of the quality of the training (including the user of new technologies);

- Tutorial seminars should be supported where interdisciplinary cooperation takes place (e.g. the historian and the pedagogic expert working together on one course to combine their different types of expertise);

- Institutional co-operation between ministries, ITT institutes and universities and the schools (for practical training) should be developed and responsibility for the improvement of history teaching should not just be given to individual teachers. Teachers need to be encouraged and supported by institutional or organisational structures (e.g. the improvement of practical skills);

- A database on written material for ITT in the region should be developed;

- Students should be involved actively in decisions about their training: topics, training methods, reflection and evaluation of their practical experience;

- Ministries should support the development of specific materials by teams of teacher trainers: specialists in history, pedagogy, psychology;

- Ministries of Education should support the training of students from rural areas or specific regions by organising summer camps and/or by developing other suitable ways of improving their teaching skills (already during periods of study);

- Ministries of Education should help in co-ordinating curricula of different training institutions (e.g. through a framework for ITT history curricula). More systematic links between ITT and in-service training seem desirable and ministries should help in developing and institutionalising structures of ITT and INSET at the national level.

- Regarding teaching material the ministry should elaborate and make transparent the forms of evaluation which it employs. This also applies to the evaluation of teachers.

Priorities for the training of trainers

It seemed to the working group that, with some exceptions, there is no special preparation or training provided for teacher trainers. They also need to improve their skills and training structures should be developed for this purpose.

Priorities for the Council of Europe

The Council should regularly bring together the national representatives of ITT and INSET and promote connections at an international level.

The Plan for the Study on History Education in Initial Teacher Training

November 2000: distribute the questionnaire

November 2000-March 2001: collecting data at local level and sending results to the research group in Vienna. The group will then analyse the data and feedback the overall results.

April 2001: project meeting to identify crucial points and to work on the structure of the comparative report.

Autumn 2001: editing the comparative study

2002: start of the second phase of the project:

seminars for teacher trainers;
seminars for persons responsible for ITT.

Participants of Workshop A hoped that there would be a regular exchange of information and experience on ITT in the region and that there would be support by educational institutions to facilitate this.

Alois Ecker
September 2000

Membership of Workshop Group A:

Romeo Gurakuqi (Albania)
Naida Susic-Mehmedagic (Bosnia-Herzegovina)
Ivica Prlender (Croatia)
Christina Koulouri (Greece)
Novica Veljanovski ("the former yugoslav Republique of Macedonia")
Jasmina Djordjevic (Montenegro)
Laura Capita (Romania)
Danigela Trskan (Slovenia)
Murat Hatipoglu (Turkey)

Report of Workshop Group B: In-service Training for History Teachers
Group Animator: Joke van der Leeuw-Roord, Executive Director, EUROCLIO

Procedure of the working group sessions

The initial sessions outlined the reasons for organising a special working group on in-service training of teachers in South East Europe and identified those factors which make good history teacher in-service training. In the third session, the working group members defined regional priorities. In the last session, small multilateral groups developed models for regional in-service training seminars according to the priorities of the working group.

The members of the working group represented the following countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina with representatives of the Croat and Serbian Entities, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Yugoslavia (including Montenegro), "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Romania, Slovenia and Turkey. The working group also reflected the different stages of development and the diverse financial possibilities of the countries in South Eastern Europe. Some countries had computers in all schools and a choice of textbooks; other countries had hardly enough books to serve each pupil. Despite these differences the participants were able to find many common grounds for further regional action.

What are the needs of the countries of South East Europe regarding good in-service training?

In the first plenary session of the conference, the country reports revisited a clear group of key issues. None of the countries had completed an intensive process of educational change. History was considered as one of the most complicated subjects as it had been closely connected with the ideologies of the former regimes. The reforms in this subject had to focus on new content but also to make a shift from the traditional pedagogical approaches to active learning. Shared concerns were expressed about the lack of strategies and the severely limited resources for implementation of innovations and the insufficient possibilities for training the trainers.

The working group was especially concerned about history curricula in most of the countries. There was still an imbalance between political, social, economic and cultural history with far too much emphasis given to political history. They also felt that the aims of most of the history curricula are formulated from the perspectives of adults and do not take into consideration the position of a child. In many countries, the understanding and implementation of the new aims of the history curricula were also problematic. The translation into a practical classroom level had not yet taken place. A further problem related to curriculum issues was the unclear relation between the history curriculum or study programme and the textbooks. In too many countries, textbooks were written without really taking into consideration the (pedagogical) implications of the new history curricula.

Considering all these problems related to history curricula in South East Europe, it would be good in the coming years to focus multilateral activities on the development and implementation of history curricula as well as initial and in-service training.

Key elements for teacher training

In the brainstorming session about the issues to tackle during in-service training, several recurring elements emerged. The most important elements for in-service courses should be:

Discussion of what it means to be a history teacher;
Focus on strategies for active learning;
Focus on the changing role of the teachers from teacher to process manager/organiser;
The development of cross-curricular projects;
The development of strategies and ideas for innovative assessment.

The participants felt that difficult content matters could only be addressed in the classroom once working teachers were trained in innovative pedagogical approaches.

Priorities

The total list of elements which should be covered in in-service programmes was long. Therefore, the working group decided to prioritise those issues which were considered most important for regional in-service training programmes in the immediate future. To prevent a mere shopping list, the participants decided to develop a framework which could act as a model for the design of in-service programmes. They identified the following elements:

Curriculum
Content/topics
Utilisation
Working methods

Resources
Textbooks
Additional materials

Information and communication technologies
Assessment

In addition in each seminar, there could be a focus on more general issues, however it would be important to follow a coherent approach, where the content matter should always be related to transparent aims, ways of learning, methods, required and available resources and assessment.

The active discussion resulted in an explicit list of priorities. Regarding curriculum content, the participants concluded that future *regional* in-service training should concentrate on:

Teaching new knowledge and interpretations, especially about the 20th Century history.
Strengthening awareness of the other, the neighbour, Europe and the rest of the world.

In the area of utilisation of the curriculum, the most urgent needs were identified as:

Working with the new national curricula;
School curriculum development.

The participants pointed out that the working methods of teachers in most of the countries in the region came down to "chalk and talk", i.e. teachers doing much of the talking and summarising key points on the blackboard. Therefore, much attention should be paid in in-service training courses to:

Developing ways of active learning such as group-work, role-play, discussion lessons, inquiry, project work, essay writing;
Multiperspectivity in history teaching;
Asking questions;
Reinforcing skills, competencies and attitudes;
Innovative teaching approaches which enhance critical thinking, understanding and effectiveness of the learning and teaching of history;
Differentiation in classroom, especially for pupils with different abilities.

On resources the participants agreed on the following needs and priorities for textbooks:

How to choose new textbooks?
Working creatively with traditional and new history textbooks.

The use, opportunities and problems of *Information and Communication Technology* in the learning and teaching of history were generally considered so important that the participants recommended that this should be a compulsory aspect of each training seminar.

Everybody understood that innovative assessment plays a major role in fostering educational change. Therefore, it was also recommended that a variety of issues related to assessment should be prioritised. These included:

Identifying what I wish my pupils to achieve;
Identifying what should my pupils be able to perform? Facts, skills, attitudes and values;
Encouraging teachers how to assess new approaches;
Developing interesting and adequate methods of assessment of skill based learning and teaching of history;
Determining the criteria for assessment. What does a mark mean, when do we give a 1 or a 5?
How to achieve progression in pupils' performances.

Although a discussion about university entrance examinations was outside the remit of this working group, it is important to point out that more should be done on a national and international level to combine the process of educational reform with assessment requirements for institutes for higher education and universities. If these requirements show no congruence with the developments in primary and secondary education, there is little chance of success for the reform process.

Outside this coherent framework approach, there were some general issues, which needed consideration, when in-service training programmes are organised. Teachers should be inspired to discuss and seek solutions to the following issues:

Formulating and understanding the aims of learning and teaching of history;
How to stimulate pupils interest in the learning of history;
How to handle sensitive and controversial issues;
How to organise civic education and training of democratic practice in school history.

Models for INSET courses

In the last session, small multilateral groups of participants proposed models for bilateral and multilateral INSET courses on the learning and teaching of history in the region according to the priorities and within the framework established by the group. It was interesting to notice how one specific framework still offered opportunities for a diversity of courses.

The proposed INSET courses all took a historical topic as basis for the programme. It is clearly a basic need for history educators to find a common historical theme as a basis for their work. From there, they like to look for translations of often abstract and difficult subject matters into classroom practice. A course should start with identifying clear aims for teaching such topics. In relation to the chosen topic and its aims, the proposed INSET courses should explore such issues as: how to teach in a multiperspectival way, how to engage the pupils, what could be the possibilities for active working and what sorts of resources are available and desired. Finally, different aspects of assessment should be included.

Conclusions

In-service training for history teachers is an issue of major concern for the region. The proposed educational reforms can only be carried out when teachers are trained in the new requirements. There is a long list of issues which need to be tackled during INSET courses. The participants prioritised the most urgent needs.

The history curricula in the countries of the region still leave much to be desired. Further discussion about curriculum choice, development and implementation should be a focal area for governments, the national and international organisations and NGOs.

Demands

The working group considers it vital that *the educational authorities in the countries of the region should allow history teachers a reasonable amount of time each year to upgrade their professional skills and to follow in-service training in subject related teacher in-service training*. The participants further

invited *the national governments, the EU, the Council of Europe and other organisations to allocate money for in-service training programmes for history educators.*

Recommendation

The participants recommended that *priority should be given to the training of the trainers, since they act as "multipliers".* The participants defined trainers in this context as *all people who are involved in history teacher in-service training including History Teachers' Associations and other NGOs.* It must be clear that the participation of experienced teachers in such training seminars is vital to ensure that the practical dimension and practical demands are addressed.

It was a great pleasure to be the animator of such an active and positive working group.

Joke van der Leeuw-Roord,
September 2000

Membership of Workshop Group B
Fatmiroshe Xhemali (Albania)
Djordje Licina (Bosnia-Herzegovina)
Tatiana Tzvetkova (Bulgaria)
Christina Koulouri (Greece)
Natalija Popovska ("the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia")
Mihai Manea (Romania)
Sasa Mikic (Slovenia)
Seqil Meydan (Turkey)
Ana Pesikan (Yugoslavia)

Workshop B: Appendices

1. List of points and priorities for in-service training courses.

General issues related to in-service training

Formulating and understanding the aims of learning and teaching of history
Stimulating pupils interest in the learning of history
How to handle sensitive and controversial issues.
Train the trainers

Civic education and training of democratic practice in school history
What does it mean to be a history teacher?
Developing cross-curricular projects
Teaching history in a multicultural society
Introducing aspects such as gender, human rights and environment in history education.
Teaching history with a European and Global dimension.
How to link out of school knowledge to school knowledge
What does it mean when pupils have to be active learners?
Changing the role of the teachers from teacher to process manager/organiser

Curriculum

Content
Teaching new knowledge and interpretations of:
Ottoman Period
20th Century history
Balkan wars
World War II and consequences
Strengthening awareness of the other, the neighbour, Europe, global dimension
Teaching history with a good balance between local, regional, national, European and global perspective.

Approaches

Working with the new national curricula
School Curriculum development
Translate the aims of the curriculum into a practical level

Working methods

Active learning
Ways of active learning: Group-work, role-play, discussion lessons, inquiry, project work, essay writing
Multiperspectivity in history teaching
Asking questions
Re-inforcing skills, competencies and attitudes
Innovative teaching approaches which enhance critical thinking, understanding and effectiveness of the learning and teaching of history
Differentiation in classroom (age groups and abilities)

Evidence based learning
Working with written sources
Working with visual sources
Working with artefacts
Setting tasks
Out of school learning

Resources

Textbooks
How to chose new textbooks?
Working with traditional and new history textbooks

Additional materials
The use, opportunities and problems of Information and Communication Technology in the learning and teaching of history.
How to create and apply new computer software and info graphics
Develop additional sources for classroom practice

Assessment

Identify what do I wish my pupils to achieve?
Identify what should my pupils be able to perform? Facts, skills, attitudes and values
Show teachers how to assess new approaches
Develop interesting and adequate methods of assessment of skill based learning and teaching of history.
What does a mark mean, when do we give a 1 or a 5
How to reach progression in pupils performances

(N.B. Bold means prioritised by the working group members)

2. Proposed models for in-service training courses.

Proposal I
20th Century History of South East Europe

General aims

To identify aims of learning and teaching of the history of the 20th Century
Identify the main features of a multicultural society

To handle controversial issues such as political and social life, religion, influence of the West, the position during WWII, communism and the West and the Soviet Union
To stimulate pupils interest for recent history
To use 20th Century history to cultivate students abilities in civic and democratic values and multiculturalism
To train the trainers to present a regional view on recent history

Curriculum

A general background in South East Europe
New interpretation of the 20th Century history of South East Europe
The national States and their relations
The history of everyday life using amongst others oral history
The role of ideology

Application

How is the 20th Century presented in the curricula of the countries of South East Europe?
The role of school curriculum development

Working methods

Identifying the main trends in teaching 20th Century history
Active learning approaches, group work, inquiry, discussion, project work
Critical thinking through working with historical sources
Fostering pupils' abilities, skills and competencies to become good citizens
Asking questions

Resources

The role of the traditional and innovative textbook
New sources for the classroom such as files, videotapes, small inquiries
ICT (CD-ROMs, DVD and WWW)
Assessment

Ways forward
Recommendations
Guidelines

Proposal II
Learning and teaching 20th Century history

Identify outcomes of effective learning and teaching of history

Knowledge, skills, attitudes and values

Workshop with group work plus defining priorities

Working on a specific historical topic

Looking at the same topic from different points of view(bias)
Who was right? Discussions about the reasons for the different points of view
Scenarios for lessons, including resources such as textbooks, ICT, maps, cartoons etc.
Analyses and discussion of the scenarios, improvement
Defining the sensitive and controversial elements of the topic
Assessment: What could be the right answer?

All with group work and plenary discussions

Proposal III
Sensitive and controversial issues in 20th Century History

Multiperspectivity
Apply innovative teaching approaches
Develop understanding and critical thinking
Strengthen effectiveness of the learning of history
ICT applications
Assessment to reach progression in performances

Proposal IV
20th Century History and working with new curricula

Understanding aims of the new curricula
Apply active learning approaches, group work, role-play, project work etc
Textbooks should be available
Additional sources could be developed
Assessment.

Proposal V
Assessment in the learning and teaching of history

Bring teachers together with personal developed assessment materials. These tests should be developed by others and discussed afterwards.

Report of Workshop Group C: Curricula and Resources
Group animator: Dr Ionna Laliotou, University of Thessaly, Greece

There were three main themes to this workshop:

curriculum content
textbooks (the ways in which they are written, the narratives, the formats)
the ways in which we need to implement change.

There was a general recognition within the group that more transnational perspectives were needed in history teaching and the training of history teachers but there was also concern about how curricula can address contemporary tensions and cross-border problems without reproducing these tensions in the classroom. It was felt that this raised issues for educational policy, curriculum planning, textbook publishing, history teaching, and parents' perspectives.

The workshop procedures and outcomes can be divided into three sections.

Section 1 focused mainly on historical representation and curriculum content. Several issues emerged here and it was interesting to note that debates which were discussed and rehearsed in the workshop regarding school history are the same as the debates currently taking place amongst academic historians. Issues discussed included:

How to integrate the national, regional and international historical dimensions?

The need to complement political and military history with aspects of cultural and social history and gender history.

The need to question the widely-held assumption that social and cultural history might be less controversial and sensitive than political history.

The recognition that some topics and themes, such as the legacy and heritage of the Ottoman Empire, are integral parts of the history of the whole area.

In most curricula and textbooks, there is not enough emphasis on the teaching of history outside Europe and North America. It was felt by the group that there should be more emphasis on African and Asian history.

It was felt that it would be useful to compare curricula in neighbouring countries and to comparatively examine the changes that are taking place across the region. This would necessitate a systematic exchange of information.

More work is needed to implement new teaching methods in the classroom and to explore the potential role that curriculum developments and new textbooks can play in facilitating and supporting this process.

A need to recognise that when planning in-service training programmes or changes in the initial training of history teachers, or changes in curricula and textbooks there are other stakeholders besides the policy makers and teachers, including parents and the students themselves. In particular, the teaching of recent and contemporary history raises issues about how we should deal with 'street history' in the classroom.

How do we use sources, including visual and oral as well as written sources in our teaching? How do we take students' and their families' experiences into account in our teaching?

Section 2 focused more on resources, especially textbooks. Much of the discussion within the group centred on informing each other about the textbooks used in the different countries represented at the Workshop. This information exchange led to a discussion on the problems of language and communication, particularly when textbooks look at "the Other" or neighbouring countries, particularly on sensitive issues, border disputes and regional wars.

It was apparent that, in recent years, all countries in the region have been experiencing similar processes of curricular revision and textbook development in the area of history. Discussions within the group revealed similar patterns. For example:

- More emphasis on international and European history;

- More Balkan history - but still early days in the developmental process;

- A greater tendency to present Balkan history as part of international and European history;

- The introduction of more social and cultural history;
- The use of a wider range of sources in textbooks including types of sources not previously used.

Section 3: What is to be done?

Topics which need more consideration in curriculum and textbook development

What do we mean by 'national' history, ethnicity, statehood, territory?

How do we identify the topics which are well-suited to a regional perspective? Which ones? Where is the common ground? Would these 'regional topics' receive the same level of priority in different countries within the region?

What is multiperspectivity and how do we teach it?

Which aspects of national histories raise key issues for teacher training? Are they the same in different countries? How can we deliver regional in-service training on these topics in a way that is meaningful to all?

How can we overcome terminological differences when teaching regional history and engaging in the multilateral development of regional resources and textbooks? There are a number of terms that change meaning from one Balkan language to another, including millet, State, nation, etc.

How do we generate the multilateral discussions that are needed?

The group felt that workshops were needed initially at the national level in each country and then at a regional level (with

the first being a form of preparation for the second). The aims of these workshops would be to:

- discuss the above issues in greater depth;

- develop some material which would demonstrate possible changes in curricula and textbooks - pilot materials that could be tried out and evaluated in schools across the region;

- provide a vehicle for sharing knowledge about histories of neighbouring countries.

- explore collaboratively ways of approaching those historical moments and events where each national history intersects with neighbours' histories. These are usually sensitive and controversial issues;

- organise educational exchange programmes for teacher trainers and history teachers;

- establish school partnerships and networks using ICT.

However, the group also wanted to record the problems involved in trying to address so many of these issues and implement many of these proposed changes when so many history teachers across the region are not earning a living wage.

Ionna Laliotou
University of Thessaly

Membership of Workshop Group C
Adrian Papajani (Albania)
Vlatko Marusic (Bosnia-Herzegovina)
Dimitar Popov (Bulgaria)
Irena Garkova (Bulgaria)
Snjezana Koren (Croatia)
Anastasia Kyrkini (Greece)
Vladimir Ortakovski ("the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia")
H. Yavuz Ercan (Turkey)
Edouard Matoko (UNESCO)
Robert A. Wood (USA)

APPENDIX II . SOME QUESTIONS ON THE USE OF MAPS FOR TEACHING HISTORY

Professor Evangelos Livieratos

Is it possible to teach history without maps?

How important are maps in teaching history?

Is it possible that maps alone could alter historic facts?

Is it possible to falsify history using cartographically correct maps?

Is it acceptable to neglect the scientific and technological *cartographic requirements* in preparing maps for teaching history?

How could *new information* and *communication technologies* contribute in modern history teaching? *(graphic processing* and *visualisation)*

What is the difference between *information* and *knowledge* in a history teaching process?

What is the impact of *infographics* versus the stereotype text narration in gaining historical information?

Is it possible to treat contradictory and "delicate" historical issues with *infographics*?

Is the visual component a *catalyst* in history textbook-maps (in the *student - book relation*) or a minor element of negligible importance?

What preparation and skills are required from the teacher for proper *map-uses* in History teaching?

What could be the advantages of the interactive www-use for the map related part of history teaching?

Can logistical limitations be the excuse for *graphically poor* textbooks or is this a question related to a *certain culture, missing expertise* or professional *conflict of interests?*

How is it possible to use *place-names* (toponymy) in history school-books?

Should the young people's *style* and *capacity* in *perceiving visual information* be the *driving force* in designing history school-books?

APPENDIX III . LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIR

Professor Evangelos LIVIERATOS, Professor of Chartography, University of Thessaloniki, GR - THESSALONIKI
Tel: + 30 31 99 61 17/ + 30 31 24 31 20
Fax: + 30 31 99 61 37/ + 30 31 24 31 21
E-mail: livier@topo.auth.gr

GENERAL RAPPORTEUR

Dr Robert STRADLING, Leirsinn Centre for Gaelic Affairs, The Gaelic College, University of the Highlands and Islands, Teangue, Sleat, GB - Isle of Skye IV44 8RQ
Tel: + 44 1471 844 373,
Fax: + 44 1471 844 383
E-mail: bob@smso.uhi.ac.uk;
postmaster@laoghras.demon.co.uk

KEYNOTE SPEAKER

Professor Vassilios KREMIDAS, Professor of Economic and Social History, University of Athens, GR - ATHENS
Tel: + 30 1 364 518
Fax:
E-mail: des-c@ypepth.gr

ANIMATORS

Dr Alois ECKER, Institut für Wirtschafts und Sozialgeschichte, Universität Wien, Dr Karl Lüger Ring, A - 1010 WIEN
Tel: + 4? 1 4277 41320
Fax: + 43 1 4277 94 13
E-mail: alois.ecker@univie.ac.at

Ms Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD, Executive Director, EUROCLIO, Juliana van Stolberglaan 41, NL - 2595 CA DEN HAAG
Tel/Fax: + 31 70 385 36 69
E-mail: joke@euroclio.nl

Dr Ioanna LALIOTOU, University of Thessaly, Contemporary History, GR - THESSALY

Tel: + 30 1 345 29 59/30 1 958 13 97
E-mail: laliotou@otenet.gr

SPEAKERS

Professor Evangelos LIVIERATOS, Professor of Chartography, University of Thessaloniki, GR - THESSALONIKI
Tel: + 30 31 99 61 17/ + 30 31 24 31 20
Fax: + 30 31 99 61 37/ + 30 31 24 31 21
E-mail: livier@topo.auth.gr

Dr Dimitrios BILALIS, University of Thessaly, Department of History - Archaeology - Social Anthropology, History and New Technologies, GR - THESSALY
Tel: + 30 1 722 53 92
Fax: + 30 1 322 15 21
E-mail: mbilalis@ha.uth.gr

ALBANIA

Ms Fatmiroshe XHEMALI, Ministry of Education and Science, Rruga e Durresit Nr 23, TIRANA
Tel: + 355 42 30197
Fax: + 355 42 32002/38 32

Mr Adrian PAPAJANI, Specialist in the Institute of Pedagogical Research (in charge of in-service teacher training), TIRANA
Tel: + 355 42 23860/20171 (home)
Fax: + 355 42 38 32

Mr Romeo GURAKUQI, Pedagogue of History, University of Shkodra, SHKODRA
Tel: + 355 22 42306
Fax: + 355 22 43747
E-mail: Romeo@unishk.albnet.net or R.Gurakuqi@GMX.DE

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Professor Naida SUSIC-MEHMEDAGIC, Professor at the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of Sarajevo, Ministry of Education, M. Dirdava 2, 71000 SARAJEVO
Tel: +387 33 663 691/387 33 458 947 (home)
Fax: +387 33 664 381/387 33 442 672 (home)
E-mail: susic@smartnet.ba

Mr Vlatko MARUSIC, History Teacher, MOSTAR
Tel:+387 88 580 011/387 88 708 027 (home)
Fax: +387 88 580 014

Mr Djordje LICINA, History Teacher, BANJA LUKA - R. SRPSKA
Tel: +387 78 213 283
Fax: +387 78 218 895

BULGARIA

Mr Dimitar POPOV, Chief Expert on History, General Education Department, Ministry of Education and Science, 2A Kniaz Dondukov Blvd. BG - 1000 SOFIA
Tel (office): + 359 2 987 66 70; (home) + 359 2 24 53 37
Fax: + 359 2 988 25 94
E-mail: d.popov@minedu.government.bg

Ms Irena GARKOVA, Expert on History, Education Inspectorate, Ministry of Education and Science - Vidin, 2 Bdintzi Square, PO Box 23, BG - 3700 VIDIN
Tel (office): + 359 94 25 846; (home) + 359 94 42 176
Fax: + 359 94 25 893
E-mail: vid112a@mon.fadata.bg

Ms Tatiana TZVETKOVA, History Teacher, 66th Secondary School, (14-22 Liubata Str., Lozenetz, Entr. V, Ap 39, BG - SOFIA
Tel (home): + 359 2 68 33 80; (school): + 359 2 55 31 53)
E-mail: Tzetkova@mb.bla-bg.com

CROATIA

Mr Lautaro GALINOVIC, Head of Department for Pre-school and Elementary Education, Ministry of Education and Sports, Trg burze 6, 10000 ZAGREB
Tel: + 385 1 4569 067
Fax: + 359 1 4610 490

Dr Ivica PRENDLER, Assistant Professor, Department for History of Central and Eastern Europe, History Section, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb, Member of the Commission for the Evaluation of History Textbooks of the Ministry of Education and Sports
Tel: + 385 1 4569 067
Fax: + 359 1 4610 490

Ms Snjezana KOREN, History Teacher, Elementary School in Velika Gorica, Member of Section for the History Teaching of the National Committee for History
Ministry of Education and Sports, Trg burze 6, 10000 ZAGREB
Tel: + 385 1 4569 067
Fax: + 359 1 4610 490
E-mail: snezana.koren@zg.tel.hr

GREECE

Mr Christos DOUKAS, General Secretary in charge of Adults Education, Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs, 15 Mitropoleaos Str., GR - 10185 ATHENS

Dr Anastassia KIRKINI, Pedagogical Institute, Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs,15 Mitropoleaos Str., GR - 10185 ATHENS
Tel: + 30 1 60 16 379
Fax: + 30 1 60 16 379
E-mail: natasa54@otenet.gr

ROMANIA

Dr Laura CAPITA, Senior Researcher, Institute of Educational Sciences, Str Stirbei Voda' 37, RO - 70732 BUCHAREST
Tel: +40 1 314 53 89/315 89 30
Fax: +40 1 312 14 47
E-mail: laura.c@ise.ro or l_capita@hotmail.com

Dr Calin FELEZEU, Babes Bolyai University, Faculty of History, Str. Mihail Kogalniceanu, nr. 22, RO - 3400 CLUJ-NAPOCA
Fax: + 40 64 191 906
Apologised for absence

Mr Mihai MANEA, Vice President of the Romanian Society of Historical Sciences, PO Box 20-79, RO-74100 BUCHAREST - 20
Tel: +40 1 321 05 35/40 92 215 446/40 92 441 524
Fax: +40 1 3210 535
E-mail: mihai.manea@k.ro or mihai_manea@lgcb.ro

SLOVENIA

Dr Bojan BALKOVEC, Professor of History at the Faculty of Arts, History Department, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za zgodovino,

Askerceva 2, 1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: + 386 1 241 10 00/386 1 437 74 02 (home)/386 41 291 201 (mobilphone)
Fax: + 386 1 241 11 91
E-mail: bojan.balkovec@guest.arnes.si

Mag Danijela TRSKAN, Professor of Didactics at the Faculty of Arts, History Department and history teacher in secondary school, Gimnazija Bezigrad, Periceva 4, 1000 LJUBLJANA
Tel: + 386 1 3000 400
Fax: + 386 1 3000 440
E-mail: danijela.trskan@guest.arnes.si

Mr Sasa MIKIC, Adviser for History, National Education Institute, Zavod RS za solstvo. OE MARIBOR, Trg revolucije 7, 2000 MARIBOR
Tel: + 386 2 332 67 81/386 2 417 112 (home)/386 41 549 118 (mobilphone)
Fax: + 386 2 332 67 07
E-mail: sasa.mikic@guest.arnes.si or sasa.mikic@zrss.si

"THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA"

Dr Vladimir ORTAKOVSKI, Undersecretary, Ministry of Education and Science, Str. D Cupovski 9, MK 9100 SKOPJE
Tel: +389 91 117 277
Fax: +389 91 118 414
E-mail: ortak@osi.net.mk

Dr Novica VELJANOVSKI, Director of the Institute of the National History of the Republic of Macedonia,

Ms Natalija POPOVSKA, Institute of National History of the Republic of Macedonia, SKOPJE

TURKEY

Professor Dr H YAVUZ ERCAN, Ankara Üniversitesi, DTC Fakültesi, TR - ANKARA
Tel: + 90 312 310 3280 x 1199
Fax: + 90 312 310 5713

Associate Professor M Murat HATIPOGLU, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Atatürk Ilkeleri ve Inkilap Tarihi Enstitüsü, 06530 Beytepe, TR -

ANKARA
Tel: + 90 532 481 8317
Fax: + 90 312 491 6099
E-mail: murathatip@hotmail.com

Ms Secil Buket MEYDAN, History Teacher, TC Milli Egitim Bakanligi, Dis Iliskiler Genel Müdürlügü, 06648 - Bakanliklar, TR - ANKARA
Tel: + 90 542 375 3020
Fax: + 30 312 418 8289
E-mail: secbuk@hotmail.com

OBSERVERS

HUNGARY

Mr Zoltan ZARANDY, Policy Adviser, Ministry of Culture and Education, Department for Public Educational Development and Research, Szalay utca. 10-14, H-1884 BUDAPEST
Tel: + 36 1 331 75 75
Fax: + 36 1 331 05 99
E-mail: vilag@mail.matav.hu
Apologised for absence

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Dr Ana PESIKAN, Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Cikoa Ljubina 18-20, 11 000 BELGRADE
Tel/Fax: + 381 11 639-724
Home : +381 11 160-501
E-mail: apesikan@f.bg.ac.yu or zavram@Eunet.yu

MONTENEGRO

Ms Jasmina DJORDJEVIC, Historical Institute, Miladina Popovica 12, 81000 PODGORICA, Montenegro
Tel: +381 81 24 13 36
Fax: +381 81 24 13 36
E-mail: jasmindj@cg.ac.yu

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr Robert A WOOD, Senior Adviser for Stability Pact Implementation, Stability Pact Office, United States Department

of State, WASHINGTON DC 80520
Tel:
Fax: +1 202 736 4330
E-mail: WoodRA3@state.gov

INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

UNESCO

Mr Edouard MATOKO, Head of the Section for Education for Peace, Democracy and Human Rights, UNESCO, 7 Place de Fontenoy, F - 75352 PARIS 07 SP
Tel: + 33 1 45 68 10 00/ 21 23
Fax: + 33 1 45 68 56 39
E-mail: f.matoko@unesco.org

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

LIAISON COMMITTEE OF NGOs ENJOYING CONSULTATIVE STATUS WITH THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Mr Daniel ZIELINSKI, Chair of the Liaison Committee of NGOs enjoying Consultative Status with the Council of Europe,
Tel:
Fax: + 33 3 90 21 47 66)
E-mail:
Apologised for absence

GEORG ECKERT INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL TEXTBOOK RESEARCH

Apologised for absence

CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY AND RECONCILIATION IN SOUTH EAST EUROPE

Dr Christina KOULOURI, Associate Professor, Dimokrition University of Thrace, History and Ethnology Department, Panourgia 20, GR - 15 343 PARASKEVI ATHENS
Tel: + 30 1 601 09 71
Fax: + 30 1 600 30 26
E-mail: chkoulou@otenet.gr

ORGANISERS

Ms Roy HOURDAKI, Chief of Section, Directorate of International Relations in Education, Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs, 15 Mitropoleos Str. GR - 10185 ATHENS
Tel: + 30 1 32 39 376
Fax: + 30 1 32 21 521
E-mail: des-c@ypepth.gr

Ms Vicky ZOITOPOULOU, Administrator, Directorate of International Relations in Education, Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs, 15 Mitropoleos Str. GR - 10185 ATHENS
Tel: + 30 1 32 39 376
Fax: + 30 1 32 21 521
E-mail: des-c@ypeth.gr

COUNCIL OF EUROPE SECRETARIAT

Mr Klaus SCHUMANN, Director General IV, Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, Environment, F - 67075 STRASBOURG Cedex
Tel: + 33 388 41 20 56
Fax: + 33 388 41 27 50/56
E-mail: klaus.schumann@coe.int

Ms Alison CARDWELL, Administrator, Directorate General IV, F - 67075 STRASBOURG Cedex
Tel: + 33 388 41 26 17
Fax: + 33 388 41 27 50/56
E-mail: alison.cardwell@coe.int

Ms Tatiana MILKO, Programme Adviser, Directorate General IV, F - 67075 STRASBOURG Cedex
Tel: + 33 388 41 36 97
Fax: + 33 388 41 27 50/56
E-mail: tatiana.milko@coe.int

APPENDIX IV . PROGRAMME OF THE CONFERENCE

Thursday 28 September

09.30 - 11.00 Plenary Session

Chair: Professor Evangelos LIVIERATOS

Opening of the Meeting by:

Mr Christos DOUKAS, General Secretary in charge of Adults Education

ii. Mr Klaus SCHUMANN, Director General - Education, Culture, Youth and Sport, Environment, Council of Europe;

Keynote presentation on: "South East Europe: a regional history?" by Professor Vassilios KREMIDAS, University of Athens

11.00 - 11.30 Break

11.30 - 13.00 Plenary Session

Chair: Professor Evangelos LIVIERATOS

One representative from each of the countries will give an 8-10 minute presentation on the situation of the initial and in-service training of history teachers.

Discussion with all the participants

Brief introduction to the three working groups and their aims and working methods by Dr Robert STRADLING

13.00 - 14.00 Lunch

14.30 - 15.30 Session 1 of the parallel working groups on:

Group A: Initial training (Animator: Dr Alois ECKER)
Group B: In-service training (Animator: Ms Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD)
Group C: Teaching resources (Animator: Ms Ioanna LALIOTOU)

15.30 - 16.00 Break

16.00 - 17.00 Session 2 of the parallel working groups:

20.30 Dinner

Friday 29 September

09.30 - 11.00 Plenary Session

Chair: Ms Roy HOURDAKI

Keynote presentation on: "Teaching history with maps" by Professor Evangelos LIVIERATOS

11.00 - 11.30 Break

11.30 - 13.00 Session 3 of the parallel working groups:

13.00 - 14.00 Lunch

14.00 - 15.30 Session 4 of the parallel working groups:

15.30 - 16.00 Break

16.00 - 17.00 Plenary Session
Chair: Ms Roy HOURDAKI

Keynote presentation on: "Using new information technologies in history teaching" by Dr Dimitrios BILALIS, University of Thessaly

17.30 - 18.30 The animators should report to the General Rapporteur, the Secretariat and the organisers on the proposals emerging from their working groups.

20.30 Official Dinner

Saturday 30 September

09.30 - 11.30 Plenary Session

Chair: Ms Alison CARDWELL

Keynote presentation on: "Possibilities for the future" by Alison CARDWELL, Alois ECKER, Joke van der LEEUW-ROORD, Ioanna LALIOTOU, Robert STRADLING.

Comments by the participants.

Closing speeches :

i. Ms Alison CARDWELL, Council of Europe;

ii. Ms Roy HOURDAKI, Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs of Greece.

14.00 Visit of Athens

20.30 Dinner

Sunday 1 October 2000

Departure of the participants

Note [1] An approach advocated by Professor Antonio Nanni and his colleagues at the University of Parma in Italy. See, e.g. the journal which they produce, CEM Mondialità.

Note [2] See, Robert Stradling, *Teaching the History of 20th Century Europe*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe, forthcoming 2001.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").